

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3-5,8-10, 13, 16, 17, 20, 24-26, and 28 stand rejected. Claims 11 and 12 are allowed. Claims 2, 6, 7, 14, 15, 18, 19, 21-23 were objected to as depending to rejected base claims. Claims 26 and 27 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 2, 14, 17, 18, and 21 have been amended. New claims 29-35 have been added. No new matter has been added. The amended and new claims are supported by the original specification and figures. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the presently pending claims are allowable. Reconsideration of the Application is respectfully requested.

**1. Objection to Claims 2, 6, 7, 14, 15, 18, 19, 21-23, and 27**

The Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's indication that claims 11 and 12 are allowable and that claims 2, 6, 7, 14, 15, 18, 19, and 21-23 contain allowable subject matter.

Claim 2 has been amended to place it in independent form, incorporating the limitations of claim 1 not already present. Claims 6 and 7 depend from claim 2.

Claim 14 has been amended to place it in independent form, incorporating the limitations of claim 13 not already present. Claim 15 depends from claim 14.

Claim 18 has been amended to place it in independent form, incorporating the limitations of claim 17 not already present. Claim 19 depends from claim 18.

Claim 21 has been amended to place it independent form, incorporating the limitations of claim 1 not already present. Claims 22 and 23 depend from claim 21.

**2. Rejection of claim 26 (35 USC § 112)**

Claims 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, the Examiner alleging

it does not comply with the written description requirement. Claim 26 has been cancelled, mooting the rejection.

**3. Rejection of claims 1, 3-5, 8-10, 13, 16, 17, 20, 24 and 25 (35 U.S.C. § 102(b))**

Claims 1, 3-5, 8-10, 13, 16, 17, 20, 24 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), the Examiner alleging these claims are anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,249,801 to Jarvis (“Jarvis”). Claims 1 has been amended to clarify the subject matter recited therein.

To anticipate a claim under § 102(b), a single prior art reference must identically disclose each and every claim element. M.P.E.P. § 2131. Claim 1, as currently amended, recites “gaming information coupled to the substrate, the gaming information including a random request region corresponding to a *single* game, wherein the random request region enables a plurality of computer-generated picks to be requested for the game.” Jarvis generally describes a lottery playing card having rows or arrays of numbers. The numbers can be circled by a player to identify a game selection, for example a set of numbers. The player can also automatically select a *single* random set of numbers for a *single game* without actually having to pick his or her own numbers by filling in box 26. The “easy pick” box 26 described by Jarvis allows a player to select only *one pick for one game*. Even when several different elements 26 are combined into a single object, as argued by the Examiner Jarvis still does not teach or suggest “random request region corresponding to a *single* game, wherein the random request region enables a plurality of computer-generated picks to be requested for the game” because each of elements 26 corresponds to a distinct or different game. See Jarvis, col.3, lines 8-11. Thus there is no random request region which allows the selection of a plurality of picks for a single game. Accordingly, claim 1 as amended is not anticipated by Jarvis.

Similar arguments apply to independent claims 13 and 17 which have been similarly amended. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1, 13 and 17 should be allowable over Jarvis. Claims 3-5, 8-10, 16, 20, 24 and 25 being each dependent on one of Claims 1, 13 and 17, Applicant submits that Claims 3-5, 8-10, 16, 20, 24 and 25 are allowable for at least

the same reasons as their respective parent claims. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**4. Rejection of claims 28 (35 U.S.C. § 103(a))**

Claims 28 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Examiner alleging that these claims are unpatentable over Jarvis. Claim 28 depends from claim 1 and thus should be patentable for at least the reasons given above for claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that claim 28 is allowable and respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

**5. New Claims 29-35**

New claims 29-35 depend from claim 2. Accordingly these claims should be allowable for at least the reasons given above for claim 2.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

The Office is authorized to charge any fees associated with this Amendment to Kenyon & Kenyon Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

Respectfully Submitted,

KENYON & KENYON

Dated: Nov. 25, 2005

By: 

Andrew L. Reibman  
(Reg. No. 47,893)

One Broadway  
New York, NY 10004  
(212) 425-7200

**CUSTOMER NO. 26646**